arXiv:1703.02569v1 [math.AP] 7 Mar 2017

DETERMINING ROUGH FIRST ORDER PERTURBATIONS OF THE POLYHARMONIC OPERATOR

YERNAT M. ASSYLBEKOV AND KARTHIK IYER

Abstract. We show that the knowledge of Dirichlet to Neumann map for rough A and q in $(-\Delta)^m + A \cdot D + q$ for $m \geq 2$ for a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 3$ determines A and q uniquely. The unique identifiability is proved using property of products of functions in Sobolev spaces and constructing complex geometrical optics solutions with sufficient decay of remainder terms.

1. Introduction and Statement of Results

1.1. **Introduction.** Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 3$ be a bounded open set with C^∞ boundary. Consider the polyharmonic operator $(-\Delta)^m$ where $m \geq 1$ is an integer. The operator $(-\Delta)^m$ is positive and self-adjoint on $L^2(\Omega)$ with domain $H^{2m}(\Omega) \cap H_0^m(\Omega)$, where $H_0^m(\Omega) = \{u \in H^m(\Omega) : \gamma u = 0\}$.

This operator can be obtained as the Friedrichs extension starting from the space of test functions; see, for example, [13]. Here and in what follows γ is the Dirichlet trace operator

$$\gamma : H^m(\Omega) \to \prod_{j=0}^{m-1} H^{m-j-1/2}(\partial\Omega), \quad \gamma u = (u|_{\partial\Omega}, \partial_\nu u|_{\partial\Omega}, ..., \partial_\nu^{m-1} u|_{\partial\Omega}),$$

where ν is the unit outer normal to the boundary $\partial\Omega$, and $H^s(\Omega)$ and $H^s(\partial\Omega)$ are the standard L^2 based Sobolev spaces on Ω and $\partial\Omega$ respectively for $s \in \mathbb{R}$.

Let us first consider the perturbed polyharmonic operator $\mathcal{L}_{A,q} = (-\Delta)^m + A \cdot D + q$ where A and q are sufficiently smooth and $D = -i\nabla$. For $f = (f_0, f_1, ..., f_{m-1}) \in \prod_{j=0}^{m-1} H^{2m-j-1/2}(\partial\Omega)$, consider the Dirichlet problem

$$\mathcal{L}_{A,q} u = 0 \text{ in } \Omega \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma u = f \text{ on } \partial\Omega. \tag{1.1}$$

If 0 is not in the spectrum of $\mathcal{L}_{A,q}$, it can be shown that the Dirichlet problem (1.1) has a unique solution $u \in H^{2m}(\Omega)$. We can then define the Dirichlet-to-Neumann $\mathcal{N}_{A,q}$ map as

$$\mathcal{N}_{A,q} f = (\partial_\nu^m u|_{\partial\Omega}, ..., \partial_\nu^{2m-1} u|_{\partial\Omega}) = \tilde{\gamma} u \in \prod_{j=m}^{2m-1} H^{2m-j-1/2}(\partial\Omega).$$

The inverse boundary value problem for the perturbed polyharmonic operator $\mathcal{L}_{A,q}$ is to determine A and q in Ω from the knowledge of the Dirichlet to Neumann map $\mathcal{N}_{A,q}$.

The study of inverse problems for such first order perturbations of the polyharmonic operator was initiated in [20]. More precisely, they show that for $m \geq 2$, the set of Cauchy data $C_{A,q} = \{(\gamma u, \tilde{\gamma} u) : u \in H^{2m}(\Omega) \text{ with } \mathcal{L}_{A,q} u = 0\}$ determines A and q uniquely provided $A \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega, \mathbb{C}^n) \cap \mathcal{E}'(\bar{\Omega}, \mathbb{C}^n)$ and $q \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. Regularities of A and q were substantially relaxed by the first author in [2] to $A \in W^{-\frac{m-2}{2}, \frac{2n}{m}}(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap \mathcal{E}'(\bar{\Omega})$ and $q \in W^{-\frac{m}{2}+\delta, \frac{2n}{m}}(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap \mathcal{E}'(\bar{\Omega})$, $0 < \delta < 1/2$, for the case $m < n$.

Here and in what follows, $\mathcal{E}'(\bar{\Omega}) = \{u \in \mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R}^n : supp(u) \subseteq \bar{\Omega}\}$ and $W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is the standard L^p based Sobolev space on $\mathbb{R}^n$, $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $1 < p < \infty$, which is defined via the Bessel potential operator.

We can also define the analogous spaces $W^{s,p}(\Omega)$ for Ω a bounded open set with smooth boundary. The reader is referred to [1] for properties of these spaces.

The goal of this paper is to extend the results of [2] for the case $m \geq n$. Moreover, even for $m < n$, we aim to improve the uniqueness result of [2] for a more general class of A and q.

As was observed in [32], for the case $m = 1$, there is a gauge invariance that prohibits uniqueness and therefore we can hope to recover A and q only modulo such a gauge transformation. It was shown in [32] that such uniqueness modulo a gauge invariance is possible provided that $A \in W^{2,\infty}$, $q \in L^\infty$ and dA satisfy a smallness condition. There have been many successive papers which have weakened the regularity assumptions on A and q. The reader is referred to [14, 21, 25, 30, 34] for details.

Inverse problems for higher order operators have been considered in [2,3,20,22,35,36] where unique recovery actually becomes possible. Higher order polyharmonic operators occur in the areas of physics and geometry such as the study of the Kirchoff plate equation in the theory of elasticity, and the study of the Paneitz-Branson operator in conformal geometry; for more details see monograph [11].

Let us remark that the problem considered in this paper can be considered as a generalization of the Calderón's inverse conductivity problem [6], also known as electrical impedance tomography, for which the question of reducing regularity has been studied extensively. In the fundamental paper by Sylvester and Uhlmann [33] it was shown that C^2 conductivities can be uniquely determined from boundary measurements. Successive papers have focused on weakening the regularity for the conductivity; see [5, 7, 12, 15, 16, 27] for more details.

1.2. **Statement of Result.** Throughout this paper we assume $m \geq 2$ and $n \geq 3$. Suppose that the first order perturbation A be in $W^{-\frac{m}{2}+1,p'}(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap \mathcal{E}'(\bar{\Omega})$, where p' satisfies

$$\begin{cases} p' \in [2n/m, \infty) & \text{if} \quad m < n, \\ p' \in (2, \infty) & \text{if} \quad m = n \quad \text{or} \quad m = n+2, \\ p' \in [2, \infty) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{1.2}$$

For a fixed δ with $0 < \delta < \frac{1}{2}$, suppose that the zeroth order perturbation q be in $W^{-\frac{m}{2}+\delta,r'}(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap \mathcal{E}'(\bar{\Omega})$, where r' satisfies

$$\begin{cases} r' \in [2n/(m-2\delta), \infty), & \text{if} \quad m < n, \\ r' \in [2n/(m-2\delta), \infty), & \text{if} \quad m = n, \\ r' \in [2, \infty), & \text{if} \quad m \geq n+1. \end{cases} \tag{1.3}$$

Before stating the main result, we consider the bi-linear forms B_A and b_q on $H^m(\Omega)$ which are defined by

$$B_A(u,v) := B_A^{\mathbb{R}^n}(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}) := \langle A, \tilde{v} D\tilde{u} \rangle, \quad b_q(u,v) := b_q^{\mathbb{R}^n}(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}) := \langle q, \tilde{u}\tilde{v} \rangle \tag{1.4}$$

for all $u, v \in H^m(\Omega)$, where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes the distributional duality on $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\langle \cdot, \bar{\cdot} \rangle$ naturally extends $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$-inner product, and $\tilde{u}, \tilde{v} \in H^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$ are any extensions of u and v, respectively. In Appendix A, we show that these definitions are well defined i.e. independent of the choice of extensions $\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}$. Using a property of multiplication of functions in Sobolev spaces, we show that the forms B_A and b_q are bounded on $H^m(\Omega)$. We also adopt the convention that for any $z > 1$, the number z' is defined by $z' = z/(z-1)$.

Consider the operator D_A, which is formally $A \cdot D$ where $D_j = -i\partial_j$, and the operator m_q of multiplication by q. To be precise, for $u \in H^m(\Omega)$, $D_A(u)$ and $m_q(u)$ are defined as

$$\langle D_A(u), \psi \rangle_\Omega = B_A(u, \psi) \quad \textit{and} \quad \langle m_q(u), \psi \rangle_\Omega = b_q(u, \psi), \quad \psi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega),$$

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_\Omega$ is the distribution duality on Ω such that $\langle \cdot, \bar{\cdot} \rangle_\Omega$ naturally extends $L^2(\Omega)$-inner product. The operators D_A and m_q are shown in Appendix A to be bounded $H^m(\Omega) \to H^{-m}(\Omega)$ and hence, standard arguments show that the operator $\mathcal{L}_{A,q} = (-\Delta)^m + D_A + m_q : H^m(\Omega) \to H^{-m}(\Omega) = (H_0^m(\Omega))'$ is a Fredholm operator with index 0.

For $f = (f_0, f_1, ..., f_{m-1}) \in \prod_{j=0}^{m-1} H^{m-j-1/2}(\partial\Omega)$, consider the Dirichlet problem (1.1). If 0 is not in the spectrum of $\mathcal{L}_{A,q}$, it is shown in Appendix B that the Dirichlet problem (1.1) has a unique solution $u \in H^m(\Omega)$. We define the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map $\mathcal{N}_{A,q}$ weakly as follows

$$\langle N_{A,q} f, \bar{h} \rangle_{\partial\Omega} = \sum_{|\alpha|=m} \frac{m!}{\alpha!} (D^\alpha u, D^\alpha v_h)_{L^2(\Omega)} + B_A(u, \bar{v}_h) + b_q(u, \bar{v}_h), \tag{1.5}$$

where $h = (h_0, h_1, ..., h_{m-1}) \in H^{m-j-1/2}(\partial\Omega)$, $v_h \in H^m(\Omega)$ is any extension of h so that $\gamma v_h = h$, and where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\partial\Omega}$ is the distribution duality on $\partial\Omega$ such that $\langle \cdot, \bar{\cdot} \rangle_{\partial\Omega}$ naturally extends $L^2(\partial\Omega)$-inner product. It is shown in Appendix B that $\mathcal{N}_{A,q}$ is a well-defined bounded as an operator

$$\prod_{j=0}^{m-1} H^{m-j-1/2}(\partial\Omega) \to \left(\prod_{j=0}^{m-1} H^{m-j-1/2}(\partial\Omega) \right)' = \prod_{j=0}^{m-1} H^{-m+j+1/2}(\partial\Omega).$$

Our main result is as follows.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 3$ be a bounded open set with C^∞ boundary, and let $m \geq 2$ be an integer. Let $0 < \delta < 1/2$. Suppose that A_1, A_2 satisfy (1.2) and q_1, q_2 satisfy (1.3) and 0 is not in the spectrums of $\mathcal{L}_{A_1,q_1}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{A_2,q_2}$. If $\mathcal{N}_{A_1,q_1} = \mathcal{N}_{A_2,q_2}$, then $A_1 = A_2$ and $q_1 = q_2$.*

Detailed explanation of the assumption $\delta > 0$ is given in Remark 3.4.

For the proof of Theorem 1.1, we follow a similar approach as in [2]. The key ingredient in the proof of Theorem 1.1 is construction of complex geometric optics solutions for the operator $\mathcal{L}_{A,q}$ with correct decay for the remained term. For this, we use the method of Carleman estimates which is based on the corresponding Carelman estimates for the Laplacian, with a gain of two derivatives, due to Salo and Tzou [31] and Proposition 2.2, which gives property of products of functions in various Sobolev spaces.

The idea of constructing such complex geometric optics solutions to elliptic operators goes back to the fundamental paper by Sylvester and Uhlmann [33] and has been extensively used to show unique recovery of coefficents in many inverse problems.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. We construct complex geometrical optics solutions for the perturbed polyharmonic operator $\mathcal{L}_{A,q}$ with A and q as defined in (1.2) and (1.3) respectively. The proof of Theorem 1.1 is given in section 3. In Appendix A, we study mapping properties of D_A and m_q. Appendix B is devoted to the well-posedness of the Dirichlet problem $\mathcal{L}_{A,q}$ with A satisfying (1.2) and q satisfying (1.3). In Appendix C, we specify why we use Bessel potential to define fractional Sobolev spaces.

2. Carleman estimate and CGO solutions

Let us first derive Carleman estimates for the operator $\mathcal{L}_{A,q}$. We first recall the Carleman estimates for the semi-classical Laplace operator $-h^2\Delta$ with a gain of two derivatives, established in [31]. Let $\tilde{\Omega}$ be an open set in $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\bar{\Omega} \subset\subset \tilde{\Omega}$ and let $\phi \in C^\infty(\tilde{\Omega}, \mathbb{R})$. Consider the conjugated operator $P_\phi = e^{\phi/h}(-h^2\Delta)e^{-\phi/h}$, and it's semi classical principal symbol $p_\phi(x, \xi) = \xi^2 + 2i\nabla\phi \cdot \xi - |\nabla\phi|^2$, $x \in \tilde{\Omega}$, $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Following [19], we say that ϕ is a limiting Carleman weight for $-h^2\Delta$ in $\tilde{\Omega}$, if

$\nabla\phi \neq 0$ in $\tilde{\Omega}$ and the Poisson bracket of $Re\, p_\phi$ and $Im\, p_\phi$ satisfies $\{Re\, p_\phi, Im\, p_\phi\}(x,\xi) = 0$ when $p_\phi(x,\xi) = 0$, $(x,\xi) \in \tilde{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R}^n$.

Before we state the Carleman estimates in [31], we define the semi-classical Sobolev norms on $\mathbb{R}^n$

$$||u||_{H^s_{scl}(\mathbb{R}^n)} := ||\langle hD\rangle^s u||_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)},$$

where $\langle\xi\rangle = (1+|\xi|^2)^{1/2}$ and $s \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proposition 2.1. *Let ϕ be a limiting Carleman weight for $-h^2\Delta$ in $\tilde{\Omega}$ and let $\phi_\epsilon = \phi + \frac{h}{2\epsilon}\phi^2$. Then for $0 < h \ll \epsilon \ll 1$ and $s \in \mathbb{R}$, we have*

$$\frac{h}{\sqrt{\epsilon}}||u||_{H^{s+2}_{scl}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C||e^{\phi_\epsilon/h}(-h^2\Delta)e^{-\phi_\epsilon/h}u||_{H^s_{scl}(\mathbb{R}^n)}, \quad C > 0$$

for all $u \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$.

We now state a theorem on products of functions in Sobolev spaces; see Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 in [29, Section 4.4.4].

Proposition 2.2. *Let $0 < s_1 \leq s_2$. Suppose*

(a) $p^{-1} \leq p_1^{-1} + p_2^{-1} \leq 1$;

(b) *either*

$$\frac{n}{p} - s_1 > \begin{cases} (\frac{n}{p_1} - s_1)^+ + (\frac{n}{p_1} - s_2)^+ & \text{if } max_i(\frac{n}{p_i} - s_i) > 0 \\ max_i(\frac{n}{p_i} - s_i) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

or

$$\frac{n}{p} - s_1 = \begin{cases} (\frac{n}{p_1} - s_1)^+ + (\frac{n}{p_1} - s_2)^+ & \text{if } max_i(\frac{n}{p_i} - s_1) > 0 \\ max_i(\frac{n}{p_i} - s_1) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases},$$

$$\{i \in \{1,2\} : s_i = n/p_i \text{ and } p_i > 1\} = \varnothing.$$

If $u \in W^{s_1,p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $v \in W^{s_2,p_2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, then $uv \in W^{s_1,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Moreover, the pointwise multiplication of functions is a continuous bi-linear map $W^{s_1,p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \cdot W^{s_2,p_2}(\mathbb{R}^n) \hookrightarrow W^{s_1,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and

$$||uv||_{W^{s_1,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C||u||_{W^{s_1,p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n)}||v||_{W^{s_2,p_2}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \tag{2.1}$$

where the constant C depends only on the various indices.

We now derive Carleman estimate for the perturbed operator $\mathcal{L}_{A,q}$ when A and q are as in (1.2) and (1.3) respectively. We have the following estimate.

Proposition 2.3. *Let ϕ be a limiting Carleman weight for $-h^2\Delta$ in $\tilde{\Omega}$ and suppose A and q satisfy (1.2) and (1.3), respectively. Then for $0 < h \ll 1$,we have*

$$||u||_{H^{m/2}_{scl}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim \frac{1}{h^m}||e^{\phi/h}(h^{2m}\mathcal{L}_{A,q})e^{-\phi/h}u||_{H^{-3m/2}_{scl}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \tag{2.2}$$

for all $u \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$.

Proof. Iterate the Carleman estimate in Proposition 2.1 m times with $s = -3m/2$ and a fixed $\epsilon > 0$ sufficiently small and independent of h to get the estimate

$$\frac{h^m}{\epsilon^{m/2}}||u||_{H^{m/2}_{scl}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C||e^{\phi_\epsilon/h}(-h^2\Delta)^m e^{-\phi_\epsilon/h}u||_{H^{-3m/2}_{scl}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \tag{2.3}$$

for all $u \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ and $0 < h \ll \epsilon \ll 1$.

Let $\psi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$. By duality and Proposition 2.2, we have for any $m \geq 2$

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle e^{\phi_\epsilon/h} h^{2m} m_q(e^{-\phi_\epsilon/h}u), \psi\rangle| &\leq h^{2m}||q||_{W^{-\frac{m}{2}+\delta,r'}(\mathbb{R}^n)}||u\psi||_{W^{\frac{m}{2}-\delta,r}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \\ &\leq Ch^{2m}||q||_{W^{-\frac{m}{2}+\delta,r'}(\mathbb{R}^n)}||u||_{H^{\frac{m}{2}-\delta}(\mathbb{R}^n)}||\psi||_{H^{\frac{m}{2}-\delta}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \\ &\leq Ch^m||u||_{H^{m/2}_{scl}(\mathbb{R}^n)}||\psi||_{H^{m/2}_{scl}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \\ &\leq Ch^m||u||_{H^{m/2}_{scl}(\mathbb{R}^n)}||\psi||_{H^{3m/2}_{scl}(\mathbb{R}^n)}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

Remark 2.4. *Estimate (2.4) actually goes through even for $\delta = 0$. For $m < n$, in Propostion 2.2, we choose $p_1 = p_2 = 2$, $r = p \in (1, \frac{2n}{2n-m}]$, $s_1 = s_2 = \frac{m}{2}$. For $m = n$, we choose $p_1 = p_2 = 2$, $r = p \in (1, 2)$, $s_1 = \frac{m}{2}, s_2 = \frac{m}{2}$. Finally, for $m > n$, we choose $p_1 = p_2 = 2$, $r = p \in (1, 2]$, $s_1 = s_2 = \frac{m}{2}$. It is also easy to see that we in fact have a stronger decay of $\mathcal{O}(h^{m+2\delta})$ in (2.4).*

By definition of dual norm,

$$||e^{\phi_\epsilon/h} h^{2m} m_q(e^{-\phi_\epsilon/h}u)||_{H^{-3m/2}_{scl}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq Ch^m||q||_{W^{-\frac{m}{2}+\delta,r'}(\mathbb{R}^n)}||u||_{H^{m/2}_{scl}(\mathbb{R}^n)}. \tag{2.5}$$

For $m > 2$, by duality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle e^{\phi_\epsilon/h} h^{2m} D_A(e^{-\phi_\epsilon/h}u), \psi\rangle| &= |\langle h^{2m} A, e^{\phi_\epsilon/h}\psi D(e^{-\phi_\epsilon/h}u)\rangle| \\ &\leq |\langle h^{2m-1} A, \psi[-u(1 + h\phi/\epsilon)D\phi + hDu]\rangle \\ &\leq Ch^{2m-1}||A||_{W^{-\frac{m}{2}+1,p'}(\mathbb{R}^n)}|| - u(1 + h\phi/\epsilon)D\phi\psi + hDu\psi||_{W^{\frac{m}{2}-1,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)}. \end{aligned}$$

Using Proposition 2.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} || - u(1 + h\phi/\epsilon)D\phi\psi + hDu\psi||_{W^{\frac{m}{2}-1,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)} &\leq C|| - u(1 + h\phi/\epsilon)D\phi + hDu||_{H^{\frac{m-2}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^n)}||\psi||_{H^{\frac{m}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \\ &\leq C|| - u(1 + h\phi/\epsilon)D\phi + hDu||_{H^{\frac{m-2}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^n)}||\psi||_{H^{m/2}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \\ &\leq Ch^{-m+1}||u||_{H^{\frac{m}{2}}_{scl}(\mathbb{R}^n)}||\psi||_{H^{\frac{m}{2}}_{scl}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \\ &\leq Ch^{-m+1}||u||_{H^{\frac{m}{2}}_{scl}(\mathbb{R}^n)}||\psi||_{H^{\frac{3m}{2}}_{scl}(\mathbb{R}^n)}. \end{aligned}$$

For $m = 2$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle e^{\phi_\epsilon/h} h^{2m} D_A(e^{-\phi_\epsilon/h}u), \psi\rangle| &= |\langle h^{2m} A, e^{\phi_\epsilon/h}\psi D(e^{-\phi_\epsilon/h}u)\rangle| \\ &\leq |\langle h^{2m-1} A, \psi[-u(1 + h\phi/\epsilon)D\phi + hDu]\rangle| \\ &\leq Ch^{2m-1}||A||_{L^n(\mathbb{R}^n)}|| - u(1 + h\phi/\epsilon)D\phi\psi + hDu\psi||_{L^{n'}(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we use Hölder's inequality and Sobolev Embedding Theorem to get

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle e^{\phi_\epsilon/h} h^{2m} D_A(e^{-\phi_\epsilon/h}u), \psi\rangle| &\leq Ch^{2m-1}||A||_{L^n(\mathbb{R}^n)}|| - u(1 + h\phi/\epsilon)D\phi + hDu||_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}||\psi||_{L^{\frac{2n}{n-2}}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \\ &\leq Ch^{2m-1}||A||_{L^n(\mathbb{R}^n)}|| - u(1 + h\phi/\epsilon)D\phi + hDu||_{H^{\frac{m-2}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^n)}||\psi||_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} \\ &\leq Ch^m||u||_{H^{m/2}_{scl}(\mathbb{R}^n)}||\psi||_{H^{m/2}_{scl}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq Ch^m||u||_{H^{m/2}_{scl}(\mathbb{R}^n)}||\psi||_{H^{3m/2}_{scl}(\mathbb{R}^n)}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for any $m \geq 2$, by definition of dual norm we have

$$||e^{\phi_\epsilon/h} h^{2m} D_A(e^{-\phi_\epsilon/h}u)||_{H^{-3m/2}_{scl}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq Ch^m||A||_{W^{-\frac{m}{2}+1,p'}(\mathbb{R}^n)}||u||_{H^{m/2}_{scl}(\mathbb{R}^n)}.$$

Combining this together with (2.3) and (2.5), for small enough $h > 0$ and $m \geq 2$, we get

$$||u||_{H^{m/2}_{scl}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim \frac{1}{h^m}||e^{\phi_\epsilon/h}(h^{2m}\mathcal{L}_{A,q})e^{-\phi_\epsilon/h}u||_{H^{-3m/2}_{scl}(\mathbb{R}^n)}. \tag{2.6}$$

Since $e^{-\phi_\epsilon/h}u = e^{-\phi/h}e^{-\phi^2/2\epsilon}u$ and ϕ is smooth, we obtain (2.2). ∎

Remark 2.5. *Note that the Carleman estimate in Proposition 2.1 is valid for any $\tilde{t} \in \mathbb{R}$. We have in particular chosen $s = -3m/2$ so that $s + 2m = m/2$. The main motivation for choosing this particular value of s is to get bounds on $H^{m/2}_{scl}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ norm of u. Though the direct problem has a solution in $H^m(\Omega)$, we only need Carleman estimates in the $H^{m/2}_{scl}$ norm.*

A natural question would be why in particular has s been chosen so that $s+2m = m/2$. If we choose $s+2m < m/2$ or $s+2m > m/2$ then in the former case we will have to take more regular A and q to ensure that we have the correct decay essentially as dictated by the hypotheses in Proposition 2.2 or in the latter case we can no longer ensure a decay of at least $\mathcal{O}(h^m)$ for $||e^{\phi/h}(h^{2m}\mathcal{L}_{A,q})e^{-\phi/h}u||_{H^s_{scl}(\mathbb{R}^n)}$ which is crucially used in the construction of complex geometric optics solutions.

We now use the above proved Carleman estimate to first establish an existence and uniqueness result for the inhomogeneous partial differential equation. Let $\phi \in C^\infty(\tilde{\Omega}, \mathbb{R})$ be a limiting Carleman weight for $-h^2\Delta$. Set

$$\mathcal{L}_\phi := e^{\phi/h}(h^{2m}\mathcal{L}_{A,q})e^{-\phi/h}.$$

By Proposition (A.4), we have

$$\langle \mathcal{L}_\phi u, \bar{v}\rangle_\Omega = \langle u, \overline{\mathcal{L}^*_\phi v}\rangle_\Omega, \quad u, v \in C^\infty_0(\Omega),$$

where $\mathcal{L}^*_\phi = e^{-\phi/h}(h^{2m}\mathcal{L}_{\bar{A},\bar{q}+D\cdot\bar{A}})e^{\phi/h}$ is the formal adjoint of $\mathcal{L}_\phi$. Note that the zeroth order coefficient of the adjoint operator $\mathcal{L}^*_{A,q}$ comprises of two terms $\bar{q}$ and $D\cdot\bar{A}$. The Carleman estimate for $\bar{q}$ is the same as (2.4) as $\bar{q}$ lies in the same class as q. However $D\cdot\bar{A} \in W^{-\frac{m}{2},p'}(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap \mathcal{E}'(\bar{\Omega})$ where $p' \geq \frac{2n}{m}$ if $m < n$, $p' > 2$ if $m = n$ or $m = n+2$ and $p' \geq 2$ otherwise and as mentioned in Remark 2.4, estimate (2.4) goes through for zeroth order pertubration belonging to this class too. Hence, estimate (2.2) is valid for $\mathcal{L}^*_\phi$, since $-\phi$ is a limiting Carleman weight as well.

We now convert the Carleman estimate (2.2) for $\mathcal{L}^*_\phi$ in to a solvability result for $\mathcal{L}_\phi$.

For $s \geq 0$, we define semi-classical Sobolev norms on a smooth bounded domain Ω as

$$||u||_{H^s_{scl}(\Omega)} := \inf_{v\in H^s_{scl}(\mathbb{R}^n),\ v|_\Omega = u} ||v||_{H^s_{scl}(\mathbb{R}^n)},$$

$$||u||_{H^{-s}_{scl}(\Omega)} := \sup_{0\neq\phi\in C^\infty_0(\Omega)} \frac{|\langle u, \bar{\phi}\rangle|}{||\phi||_{H^s_{scl}(\Omega)}}.$$

Proposition 2.6. *Let A and q be as defined in (1.2) and (1.3) respectively and let ϕ be a limiting Carleman weight for $-h^2\Delta$ on $\tilde{\Omega}$. If $h > 0$ is small enough, then for any $v \in H^{-\frac{m}{2}}(\Omega)$, there is a solution $u \in H^{\frac{m}{2}}(\Omega)$ of the equation*

$$e^{\phi/h}(h^{2m}\mathcal{L}_{A,q})e^{-\phi/h}u = v \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega$$

which satisfies

$$||u||_{H^{\frac{m}{2}}_{scl}(\Omega)} \lesssim \frac{1}{h^m}||v||_{H^{-\frac{m}{2}}_{scl}(\Omega)}.$$

Proof. Let $D = \mathcal{L}^*_\phi(C^\infty_0(\Omega))$ and consider the linear functional $L : D \to \mathbb{C}$, $L(\mathcal{L}^*_\phi w) = \langle w, v\rangle_\Omega$ for $w \in C^\infty_0(\Omega)$. By Carleman estimate (2.2),

$$|L(\mathcal{L}^*_\phi w)| \leq ||w||_{H^{m/2}_{scl}(\mathbb{R}^n)}||v||_{H^{-m/2}_{scl}(\Omega)} \leq \frac{C}{h^m}||\mathcal{L}^*_\phi w||_{H^{-m/2}_{scl}(\mathbb{R}^n)}||v||_{H^{-m/2}_{scl}(\Omega)}.$$

Hahn-Banach theorem ensures that there is a bounded linear functional $\tilde{L} : H^{-m/2}(\mathbb{R}^n) \to \mathbb{C}$ satisfying $\tilde{L} = L$ on D and $||\tilde{L}|| \leq Ch^{-m}||v||_{H^{-m/2}_{scl}(\Omega)}$. By the Riesz Representation theorem, there

is $u \in H^{m/2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that for all $\psi \in H^{-m/2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $\tilde{L}(\psi) = \langle \psi, \bar{u} \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^n}$ and

$$||u||_{H^{m/2}_{scl}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq \frac{C}{h^m} ||v||_{H^{-m/2}_{scl}(\Omega)}.$$

Let us show $\mathcal{L}_\phi u = v$ in Ω. For arbitrary $w \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$,

$$\langle \mathcal{L}_\phi u, \bar{w} \rangle_\Omega = \langle u, \overline{\mathcal{L}_\phi^* w} \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^n} = \overline{\tilde{L}(\mathcal{L}_\phi^* w)} = \overline{L(\mathcal{L}_\phi^* w)} = \overline{\langle w, v \rangle}_\Omega = \langle v, \bar{w} \rangle_\Omega.$$

This finishes the proof. ∎

We now wish to construct complex geometric optics solutions for the equation $\mathcal{L}_{A,q} u = 0$ in Ω with A and q as defined in (1.2) and (1.3) respectively using the solvability result Proposition 2.6. These are solutions of the form

$$u(x, \zeta; h) = e^{\frac{ix\cdot\zeta}{h}} (a(x, \zeta; h) + h^{m/2} r(x, \zeta; h)), \tag{2.7}$$

where $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}^n$ is such that $\zeta \cdot \zeta = 0$, $|\zeta| \sim 1$, $a \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ is an amplitude, r is a correction term, and $h > 0$ is a small parameter.

Conjugating $h^{2m}\mathcal{L}_{A,q}$ by $e^{\frac{ix\cdot\zeta}{h}}$, we get

$$e^{-\frac{ix\cdot\zeta}{h}} h^{2m} \mathcal{L}_{A,q} e^{\frac{ix\cdot\zeta}{h}} = (-h^2\Delta - 2i\zeta \cdot h\nabla)^m + h^{2m} D_A + h^{2m-1} m_{A\cdot\zeta} + h^{2m} m_q. \tag{2.8}$$

Following [21], we shall consider ζ depending slightly on h, i.e $\zeta = \zeta_0 + \zeta_1$ with ζ_0 independent of h and $\zeta_1 = \mathcal{O}(h)$ as $h \to 0$. We also assume that $|Re\,\zeta_0| = |Im\zeta_0| = 1$. Then we can write (2.8) as

$$e^{-\frac{ix\cdot\zeta}{h}} h^{2m} \mathcal{L}_{A,q} e^{\frac{ix\cdot\zeta}{h}} = (-h^2\Delta - 2i\zeta_0 \cdot h\nabla - 2i\zeta_1 \cdot h\nabla)^m + h^{2m} D_A + h^{2m-1} m_{A\cdot(\zeta_1+\zeta_0)} + h^{2m} m_q.$$

Observe that (2.7) is a solution to $\mathcal{L}_{A,q} = 0$ if and only if

$$e^{-\frac{ix\cdot\zeta}{h}} h^{2m} \mathcal{L}_{A,q} (e^{\frac{ix\cdot\zeta}{h}} h^{m/2} r) = -e^{-\frac{ix\cdot\zeta}{h}} h^{2m} \mathcal{L}_{A,q} (e^{\frac{ix\cdot\zeta}{h}} a),$$

and hence if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-\frac{ix\cdot\zeta}{h}} h^{2m} \mathcal{L}_{A,q} (e^{\frac{ix\cdot\zeta}{h}} h^{m/2} r) & \\ = -\sum_{k=0}^{m} \frac{m!}{k!(m-k)!} (-h^2\Delta - 2i\zeta_1 \cdot h\nabla)^{m-k} (-2i\zeta_0 \cdot h\nabla)^k a & \\ - h^{2m} D_A a - h^{2m-1} m_{A\cdot(\zeta_0+\zeta_1)} a - h^{2m} m_q a. & \end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

Our goal is get a decay of at least $\mathcal{O}(h^{m+m/2})$ in $H^{-m/2}_{scl}(\Omega)$ norm on the right-hand side of (2.9). The terms $h^{2m} D_A a$, $h^{2m-1} m_{A\cdot(\zeta_0+\zeta_1)} a$ and $h^{2m} m_q a$ will eventually give us a decay of $\mathcal{O}(h^{m+m/2})$ provided $m \geq 2$.

(For a smooth enough first order perturbation of the polyharmonic operator we only need an $\mathcal{O}(h^{m+1})$ decay but here we need a stronger decay of $\mathcal{O}(h^{m+m/2})$ essentially because our coefficients are less regular. See Remark 3.3 following (3.7) for more details.)

If $a \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ satisfies

$$(\zeta_0 \cdot \nabla)^j a = 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega$$

for some $j \geq 1$, then since $\zeta_1 = \mathcal{O}(h)$, the lowest order of h on the right-hand side of (2.9) is $j - 1 + 2(m - j + 1) = 2m - j + 1$ provided $j \geq 2$. We will get an overall decay of $\mathcal{O}(h^{m+m/2})$ on the right-hand side of (2.9) provided $j \leq 1 + m/2$. Since $m \geq 2$, we choose $j = 2$ to get the following transport equation

$$(\zeta_0 \cdot \nabla)^2 a = 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega. \tag{2.10}$$

Such choice of a is clearly possible. We thus obtain the following equation for r

$$\begin{aligned} &e^{-\frac{ix\cdot\zeta}{h}}h^{2m}\mathcal{L}_{A,q}(e^{\frac{ix\cdot\zeta}{h}}h^{m/2}r)\\ &\quad=-(-h^2\Delta-2i\zeta_1\cdot h\nabla)^m a-m(-h^2\Delta-2i\zeta_1\cdot h\nabla)^{m-1}(-2i\zeta_0\cdot h\nabla)a\\ &\qquad-h^{2m}D_A(a)-h^{2m-1}m_{A\cdot(\zeta_0+\zeta_1)}(a)-h^{2m}m_q(a):=g. \end{aligned}$$

We complete the proof by showing $||g||_{H^{-m/2}_{scl}(\Omega)}=\mathcal{O}(h^{m+m/2})$. We will estimate each term separately. Suppose that $\psi\in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ and $\psi\neq 0$. By Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the fact that $\zeta_1=\mathcal{O}(h)$ and $\zeta_0=\mathcal{O}(1)$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\left|(-(-h^2\Delta-2i\zeta_1\cdot h\nabla)^m a-m(-h^2\Delta-2i\zeta_1\cdot h\nabla)^{m-1}(-2i\zeta_0\cdot h\nabla)a,\psi)_{L^2(\Omega)}\right|\\ &\qquad=\mathcal{O}(h^{m+m/2})||\psi||_{L^2(\Omega)}=\mathcal{O}(h^{m+m/2})||\psi||_{H^{m/2}_{scl}(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}\tag{2.11}$$

For $m>2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle h^{2m-1}m_{A\cdot(\zeta_0+\zeta_1)}(a),\psi\rangle_\Omega|&\leq Ch^{2m-1}||A||_{W^{-\frac{m}{2}+1,p'}(\mathbb{R}^n)}||a\psi||_{W^{\frac{m}{2}-1,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)}\\ &\leq Ch^{2m-1}||a\psi||_{W^{\frac{m}{2}-1,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)}\ (\text{as } A\in W^{-\frac{m}{2}+1,p'}(\mathbb{R}^n))\\ &\leq Ch^{m+m/2+m/2-1}||\psi||_{H^{\frac{m}{2}-1}(\mathbb{R}^n)}\ (\text{by Proposition 2.2})\\ &=\mathcal{O}(h^{m+m/2})||\psi||_{H^{m/2}_{scl}(\mathbb{R}^n)}=\mathcal{O}(h^{m+m/2})||\psi||_{H^{m/2}_{scl}(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}\tag{2.12}$$

Here, we have used Proposition 2.2 for $m<n$ with $p_1=p_2=2$, $p\in(1,\frac{2n}{2n-m})$, $s_1=\frac{m}{2}-1, s_2=\frac{m}{2}$. For $m=n$, we choose $p_1=p_2=2$, $p\in(1,2)$, $s_1=\frac{m}{2}-1, s_2=\frac{m}{2}$. And for $m>n$, we choose $p_1=p_2=2$, $p\in(1,2]$, $s_1=\frac{m}{2}-1, s_2=\frac{m}{2}$. Thus (2.12) is justified for all $m>2$.

Similarly, for $m>2$, we also have

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle h^{2m}D_A(a),\psi\rangle_\Omega|&\leq Ch^{2m}||A||_{W^{-\frac{m}{2}+1,p'}(\mathbb{R}^n)}||\psi Da||_{W^{\frac{m}{2}-1,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)}\\ &\leq Ch^{m+m/2+m/2}||A||_{W^{-\frac{m}{2}+1,p'}(\mathbb{R}^n)}||\psi||_{H^{m/2}(\mathbb{R}^n)}\ (\text{by Proposition 2.2})\\ &=\mathcal{O}(h^{m+m/2})||\psi||_{H^{m/2}_{scl}(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}\tag{2.13}$$

For $m=2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle h^{2m-1}m_{A\cdot(\zeta_0+\zeta_1)}(a),\psi\rangle_\Omega|&\leq Ch^{2m-1}||A||_{L^n(\mathbb{R}^n)}||a\psi||_{L^{n'}(\Omega)}\\ &\leq Ch^{2m-1}||a\psi||_{L^{n'}(\Omega)}\\ &\leq Ch^{2m-1}||\psi||_{L^2(\Omega)}\ (\text{by Hölder's inequality})\\ &=\mathcal{O}(h^{m+m/2})||\psi||_{H^{m/2}_{scl}(\Omega)} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle h^{2m}D_A(a),\psi\rangle_\Omega|&\leq Ch^{2m}||A||_{L^n(\mathbb{R}^n)}||\psi Da||_{L^{n'}(\Omega)}\\ &\leq Ch^{m+m/2+m/2}||A||_{L^n(\mathbb{R}^n)}||\psi||_{L^2(\Omega)}\ (\text{by Hölder's inequality})\\ &=\mathcal{O}(h^{m+m/2})||\psi||_{H^{m/2}_{scl}(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}\tag{2.14}$$

We also have, for any $m\geq 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle h^{2m}m_q a,\psi\rangle_\Omega|&\leq Ch^{2m}||q||_{W^{-\frac{m}{2}+\delta,r'}(\mathbb{R}^n)}||a\psi||_{W^{\frac{m}{2}-\delta,r}(\mathbb{R}^n)}\ (\text{as } q\in W^{-\frac{m}{2}+\delta,r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))\\ &\leq Ch^{m+m/2+m/2}||q||_{W^{-\frac{m}{2}+\delta,r'}(\mathbb{R}^n)}||\psi||_{H^{\frac{m}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^n)}\ (\text{by Proposition 2.2})\\ &=\mathcal{O}(h^{m+m/2})||\psi||_{H^{m/2}_{scl}(\mathbb{R}^n)}=\mathcal{O}(h^{m+m/2})||\psi||_{H^{m/2}_{scl}(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}\tag{2.15}$$

Combining the estimates (2.11 - 2.15) we conclude that for any $m \geq 2$

$$||g||_{H^{-m/2}_{scl}(\Omega)} = \mathcal{O}(h^{m+m/2}).$$

Using this and Propostion 2.6, for $h > 0$ small enough, there exists $r \in H^{m/2}(\Omega)$ solving

$$e^{-\frac{ix\cdot\zeta}{h}} h^{2m} \mathcal{L}_{A,q}(e^{\frac{ix\cdot\zeta}{h}} h^{m/2} r) = -e^{-\frac{ix\cdot\zeta}{h}} h^{2m} \mathcal{L}_{A,q}(e^{\frac{ix\cdot\zeta}{h}} a)$$

such that

$$||h^{m/2} r||_{H^{m/2}_{scl}(\Omega)} \lesssim \frac{1}{h^m} ||e^{\frac{-ix\cdot\zeta}{h}} h^{2m} \mathcal{L}_{A,q}(e^{\frac{ix\cdot\zeta}{h}} a)||_{H^{-m/2}_{scl}(\Omega)} \lesssim \frac{1}{h^m} ||g||_{H^{-m/2}_{scl}(\Omega)} = \mathcal{O}(h^{m/2}).$$

Therefore, $||r||_{H^{m/2}_{scl}(\Omega)} = \mathcal{O}(1)$. Hence, we have the following result.

Proposition 2.7. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 3$ be a bounded open set with smooth boundary and let m be an integer so that $m \geq 2$. Suppose A and q satisfy (1.2) and (1.3), respectively, and let $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}^n$ be such that $\zeta \cdot \zeta = 0$, $\zeta = \zeta_0 + \zeta_1$ with ζ_0 independent of h and $\zeta_1 = \mathcal{O}(h)$ as $h \to 0$. Then for all $h > 0$ small enough, there exists a solution $u(x, \zeta; h) \in H^{m/2}(\Omega)$ to the equation $\mathcal{L}_{A,q} u = 0$ of the form*

$$u(x, \zeta; h) = e^{\frac{ix\cdot\zeta}{h}} (a(x, \zeta_0) + h^{m/2} r(x, \zeta; h)),$$

where $a(\cdot, \zeta_0) \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ satisfies (2.10) and the correction term r is such that $||r||_{H^{m/2}_{scl}(\Omega)} = \mathcal{O}(1)$ as $h \to 0$.

3. Integral Identity

We first do a standard reduction to a larger domain. For the proof, similarly as in [2, Proposition 3.1], we follow [21, Proposition 3.2].

Proposition 3.1. *Let Ω, $\Omega' \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be two bounded open sets such that $\Omega \subset\subset \Omega'$ and $\partial\Omega$ and $\partial\Omega'$ are smooth. Let A_1, A_2 and q_1, q_2 satisfy (1.2) and (1.3), respectively. If $\mathcal{N}_{A_1,q_1} = \mathcal{N}_{A_2,q_2}$, then $\mathcal{N}'_{A_1,q_1} = \mathcal{N}'_{A_2,q_2}$ where $\mathcal{N}'_{A_j,q_j}$ denotes the set of the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map for $\mathcal{L}_{A_j,q_j}$ in Ω', $j = 1, 2$.*

Proof. Let $f' \in \prod_{j=0}^{m-1} H^{m-j-1/2}(\partial\Omega)$ and let $v_1' \in H^m(\Omega')$ be the unique solution (See Appendix B for justification of this statement) to $\mathcal{L}_{A_1,q_1} v_1' = 0$ in Ω' with $\gamma' v_1' = f'$ on $\partial\Omega'$ where γ' denotes the Dirichlet trace on $\partial\Omega'$. Let $v_1 = v_1'\big|_\Omega \in H^m(\Omega)$ and let $f = \gamma v_1$. By the well-posedness result in Appendix B, we can guarantee the existence of a unique $v_2 \in H^m(\Omega)$ so that $\mathcal{L}_{A_2,q_2} v_2 = 0$ and $\gamma v_2 = \gamma v_1 = f$. Thus $\phi = v_2 - v_1 \in H^m_0(\Omega) \subset H^m_0(\Omega')$. Define

$$v_2' = v_1' + \phi \in H^m(\Omega').$$

Note that $v_2' = v_2$ in Ω and $\gamma' v_2' = \gamma' v_1' = f'$ on $\partial\Omega'$.

We now show that $\mathcal{L}_{A_2,q_2} v_2' = 0$ in Ω'. Let $\psi \in C^\infty_0(\Omega')$. We then have

$$\langle \mathcal{L}_{A_2,q_2} v_2', \bar{\psi} \rangle_{\Omega'} = \sum_{|\alpha|=m} \frac{m!}{\alpha!} (D^\alpha v_2', D^\alpha \psi)_{L^2(\Omega')} + \langle D_{A_2}(v_2'), \bar{\psi} \rangle_{\Omega'} + \langle m_{q_2}(v_2'), \bar{\psi} \rangle_{\Omega'}.$$

Since A_2 and q_2 are compactly supported in $\bar{\Omega}$ and $\phi \in H_0^m(\Omega)$, we can rewrite the above equality as

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \mathcal{L}_{A_2,q_2} v_2', \bar{\psi}\rangle_{\Omega'} &= \sum_{|\alpha|=m} \frac{m!}{\alpha!}(D^\alpha v_1', D^\alpha \psi)_{L^2(\Omega')} + \sum_{|\alpha|=m} \frac{m!}{\alpha!}(D^\alpha \phi, D^\alpha(\psi\big|_\Omega)_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &\quad + B_{A_2}(v_2', \bar{\psi}\big|_\Omega) + b_{q_2}(v_2', \bar{\psi}\big|_\Omega) \\ &= \sum_{|\alpha|=m} \frac{m!}{\alpha!}(D^\alpha v_1', D^\alpha \psi)_{L^2(\Omega')} - \sum_{|\alpha|=m} \frac{m!}{\alpha!}(D^\alpha v_1, D^\alpha(\psi\big|_\Omega))_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &\quad + \sum_{|\alpha|=m} \frac{m!}{\alpha!}(D^\alpha v_2, D^\alpha(\psi\big|_\Omega))_{L^2(\Omega)} + B_{A_2}(v_2', \bar{\psi}\big|_\Omega) + b_{q_2}(v_2', \bar{\psi}\big|_\Omega).\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\langle \mathcal{N}_{A_2,q_2} f, \overline{\gamma(\psi\big|_\Omega)}\rangle_{\partial\Omega} = \sum_{|\alpha|=m} \frac{m!}{\alpha!}(D^\alpha v_2, D^\alpha(\psi\big|_\Omega)_{L^2(\Omega)} + B_{A_2}(v_2', \bar{\psi}\big|_\Omega) + b_{q_2}(v_2', \bar{\psi}\big|_\Omega).$$

Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \mathcal{L}_{A_2,q_2} v_2', \bar{\psi}\rangle_{\Omega'} &= \sum_{|\alpha|=m} \frac{m!}{\alpha!}(D^\alpha v_1', D^\alpha \psi)_{L^2(\Omega')} - \sum_{|\alpha|=m} \frac{m!}{\alpha!}(D^\alpha v_1, D^\alpha(\psi\big|_\Omega))_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &\quad + \langle \mathcal{N}_{A_2,q_2} f, \gamma(\psi\big|_\Omega)\rangle_{\partial\Omega}.\end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\langle \mathcal{N}_{A_2,q_2} f, \overline{\gamma(\psi\big|_\Omega)}\rangle_{\partial\Omega} = \langle \mathcal{N}_{A_1,q_1} f, \gamma(\psi\big|_\Omega)\rangle_{\partial\Omega}$$

and

$$\langle \mathcal{N}_{A_1,q_1} f, \overline{\gamma(\psi\big|_\Omega)}\rangle_{\partial\Omega} = \sum_{|\alpha|=m} \frac{m!}{\alpha!}(D^\alpha v_1, D^\alpha(\psi\big|_\Omega))_{L^2(\Omega)} + B_{A_1}(v_1, \bar{\psi}\big|_{\partial\Omega}) + b_{q_1}(v_1, \bar{\psi}\big|_\Omega).$$

We get

$$\langle \mathcal{L}_{A_2,q_2} v_2', \bar{\psi}\rangle_{\Omega'} = \sum_{|\alpha|=m} \frac{m!}{\alpha!}(D^\alpha v_1', D^\alpha \psi)_{L^2(\Omega')} + B_{A_1}(v_1, \bar{\psi}\big|_{\partial\Omega}) + b_{q_1}(v_1, \bar{\psi}\big|_\Omega).$$

Using the fact A_1 and q_1 are compactly supported in $\bar{\Omega}$, we obtain

$$\langle \mathcal{L}_{A_2,q_2} v_2', \bar{\psi}\rangle_{\Omega'} = \sum_{|\alpha|=m} \frac{m!}{\alpha!}(D^\alpha v_1', D^\alpha \psi)_{L^2(\Omega')} + \langle D_{A_1}(v_1'), \bar{\psi}\rangle_{\Omega'} + \langle m_{q_1}(v_1'), \bar{\psi}\rangle_{\Omega'} = \langle \mathcal{L}_{A_1,q_1} v_1', \bar{\psi}\rangle_{\Omega'} = 0.$$

Using exact same arguments, one can show that $\mathcal{N}'_{A_2,q_2} f' = \mathcal{N}'_{A_1,q_1} f'$ on $\partial\Omega'$, which finishes the proof. ∎

We now derive the following integral identity based on the assumption that $\mathcal{N}_{A_1,q_1} = \mathcal{N}_{A_2,q_2}$.

Proposition 3.2. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 3$ be a bounded open set with smooth boundary. Assume that A_1, A_2 and q_1, q_2 satisfy (1.2) and (1.3), respectively. If $\mathcal{N}_{A_1,q_1} = \mathcal{N}_{A_2,q_2}$, then the following integral identity holds*

$$\langle D_{A_2-A_1}(u_2), \bar{v}\rangle_\Omega + \langle m_{q_2-q_1}(u_2), \bar{v}\rangle_\Omega = 0$$

for any $u_2, v \in H^m(\Omega)$ satisfying $\mathcal{L}_{A_2,q_2} u_2 = 0$ in Ω and $\mathcal{L}^*_{A_1,q_1} v = 0$ in Ω, respectively. Recall that $\mathcal{L}^*_{A,q} = \mathcal{L}_{\bar{A},\bar{q}+D\cdot\bar{A}}$ is the formal adjoint of $\mathcal{L}_{A,q}$.

Proof. Let v satisfy $\mathcal{L}^*_{A_1,q_1}v = 0$ in Ω. Let u_1 solve $\mathcal{L}_{A_1,q_1}u_1 = 0$ in Ω. Since $\mathcal{N}_{A_1,q_1} = \mathcal{N}_{A_2,q_2}$, we choose $u_2 \in H^m(\Omega)$ solving $\mathcal{L}_{A_2,q_2}u_2$ so that $\gamma u_1 = \gamma u_2$ and $\mathcal{N}_{A_1,q_1}\gamma u_1 = \mathcal{N}_{A_2,q_2}\gamma u_2$. It then follows that

$$\mathcal{L}_{A_1,q_1}(u_1 - u_2) = D_{A_2-A_1}(u_2) + m_{q_2-q_1}(u_2).$$

Since

$$\langle \mathcal{L}_{A,q}u, \bar{v}\rangle_\Omega = \langle u, \overline{\mathcal{L}^*_{A,q}v}\rangle_\Omega,$$

we get the desired identity. ∎

To show $A_1 = A_2$, we will need to use Poincare lemma for currents [28] which requires the domain to be simply connected. Therefore, we reduce the problem to larger simply connected domain, in particular to a ball.

Let B be an open ball in $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\Omega \subset\subset B$. According to Proposition (3.2), we know that $\mathcal{N}'^B_{A_1,q_1} = \mathcal{N}'^B_{A_2,q_2}$ denotes the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map for $\mathcal{L}_{A_j,q_j}$ in B, $j = 1, 2$. Now by Proposition (3.2), the following integral identity holds

$$B^B_{A_2-A_1}(u_2, \bar{v}) + b^B_{q_2-q_1}(u_2, \bar{v}) = 0 \tag{3.1}$$

for any $u_2, v \in H^m(B)$ satisfying $\mathcal{L}_{A_2,q_2}u_2 = 0$ in B and $\mathcal{L}^*_{A_1,q_1}v = 0$ in B, respectively. Here and in what follows, by $B^B_{A_2-A_1}$ and $b^B_{q_2-q_1}$ we denote the bi-linear forms corresponding to $A_2 - A_1$ and $q_2 - q_1$ (as defined in Appendix A) in the ball B.

The key idea in the uniqueness result is to use complex geometric optics solutions u_2 to $\mathcal{L}_{A_2,q_2}u_2 = 0$ in B and v to $\mathcal{L}^*_{A_1,q_1}v = 0$ in B and plug them in the integral identity (3.1). In order to construct these solutions, consider $\xi, \mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $|\mu_1| = |\mu_2| = 1$ and $\mu_1 \cdot \mu_2 = \xi \cdot \mu_1 = \xi \cdot \mu_2 = 0$. For $h > 0$, set

$$\zeta_2 = \frac{h\xi}{2} + \sqrt{1 - h^2\frac{|\xi|^2}{4}}\mu_1 + i\mu_2, \quad \zeta_1 = -\frac{h\xi}{2} + \sqrt{1 - h^2\frac{|\xi|^2}{4}}\mu_1 - i\mu_2.$$

Note that we have $\zeta_2 = \mu_1 + i\mu_2 + \mathcal{O}(h)$, $\zeta_1 = \mu_1 - i\mu_2 + \mathcal{O}(h)$, $\zeta_j \cdot \zeta_j = 0$, $j = 1, 2$ and $\zeta_2 - \bar{\zeta}_1 = h\xi$.

By Proposition 2.7, for all $h > 0$ small enough, there are solutions $u_2(\cdot, \zeta_2; h)$ and$v(\cdot, \zeta_1; h)$ in $H^m(B)$ to the equations $\mathcal{L}_{A_2,q_2}u_2 = 0$ and $\mathcal{L}^*_{A_1,q_1}v = 0$ in B, respectively, of the form

$$\begin{aligned} v(x, \zeta_1; h) &= e^{\frac{ix\cdot\zeta_1}{h}}(a_1(x, \mu_1 + i\mu_2) + h^{m/2}r_1(x, \zeta_1; h)), \\ u_2(x, \zeta_2; h) &= e^{\frac{ix\cdot\zeta_2}{h}}(a_2(x, \mu_1 - i\mu_2) + h^{m/2}r_2(x, \zeta_1; h)), \end{aligned}$$

where the amplitudes $a_1(x, \mu_1 + i\mu_2)$, $a_2(x, \mu_1 - i\mu_2) \in C^\infty(\bar{B})$ satisfy the transport equations

$$\begin{aligned} ((\mu_1 + i\mu_2) \cdot \nabla)^2 a_2(x, \mu_1 + i\mu_2) = 0 \quad \text{in } B, \\ ((\mu_1 - i\mu_2) \cdot \nabla)^2 a_1(x, \mu_1 - i\mu_2) = 0 \quad \text{in } B, \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

and the remainder terms $r_1(., \zeta_1; h)$ and $r_2(., \zeta_2; h)$ satisfy

$$||r_j||_{H^{m/2}_{scl}(B)} = \mathcal{O}(1), \quad j = 1, 2.$$

We substitute u_2 and v in to the (3.1) and get

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = \frac{1}{h}b^B_{\zeta_2\cdot(A_2-A_1)}(a_2 + h^{m/2}r_2, e^{ix\cdot\xi}(\bar{a}_1 + h^{m/2}\bar{r}_1)) \\ + B^B_{A_2-A_1}(a_2 + h^{m/2}r_2, e^{ix\cdot\xi}(\bar{a}_1 + h^{m/2}\bar{r}_1)) \\ + b^B_{q_2-q_1}(a_2 + h^{m/2}r_2, e^{ix\cdot\xi}(\bar{a}_1 + h^{m/2}\bar{r}_1)). \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

Multiply by h throughout and let $h \to 0$ to get

$$b^B_{(\mu_1+i\mu_2)\cdot(A_2-A_1)}(a_2, e^{ix\cdot\xi}\bar{a}_1) = 0. \tag{3.4}$$

Let us justify how we get (3.4). We use Proposition A.2 to show

$$\begin{aligned}
&|B^B_{A_2-A_1}(a_2 + h^{m/2}r_2, e^{ix\cdot\xi}(\bar{a}_1 + h^{m/2}h\bar{r}_1))| \\
&\qquad \leq C||A_1 - A_2||_{W^{-\frac{m}{2}+1,p'}(\mathbb{R}^n)}||a_2 + h^{m/2}r_2||_{H^{m/2}(B)}\,||\bar{a}_1 + h^{m/2}\bar{r}_1||_{H^{m/2}(B)} \\
&\qquad \leq C(||a_1||_{H^{m/2}(B)} + ||h^{m/2}r_1||_{H^{m/2}(B)})(||\bar{a}_2||_{H^{m/2}(B)} + ||h^{m/2}\bar{r}_2||_{H^{m/2}(B)}) \\
&\qquad \leq C(||a_1||_{H^{m/2}(B)} + ||r_1||_{H^{m/2}_{scl}(B)})\,(||\bar{a}_2||_{H^{m/2}(B)} + ||\bar{r}_2||_{H^{m/2}_{scl}(B)}) = \mathcal{O}(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$h|B^B_{A_2-A_1}(a_2 + h^{m/2}r_2, e^{ix\cdot\xi}(\bar{a}_1 + h^{m/2}\bar{r}_1))| = \mathcal{O}(h). \tag{3.5}$$

We also have for any $m \geq 2$, using Proposition A.2,

$$\begin{aligned}
&|b^B_{q_1-q_2}(a_1 + h^{m/2}r_1, e^{ix\cdot\xi}(\bar{a}_2 + h^{m/2}\bar{r}_2))| \\
&\qquad \leq C||q_1 - q_2||_{W^{-\frac{m}{2}+\delta,r'}(\mathbb{R}^n)}||a_1 + h^{m/2}r_1||_{H^{\frac{m}{2}-\delta}(B)}\,||\bar{a}_2 + h^{m/2}\bar{r}_2||_{H^{\frac{m}{2}-\delta}(B)} \\
&\qquad \leq C(||a_1||_{H^{m/2}(B)} + ||r_1||_{H^{m/2}_{scl}(B)})\,(||\bar{a}_2||_{H^{m/2}(B)} + ||\bar{r}_2||_{H^{m/2}_{scl}(B)}) = \mathcal{O}(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$h|b^B_{q_1-q_2}(a_1 + h^{m/2}r_1, e^{ix\cdot\xi}(\bar{a}_2 + h^{m/2}\bar{r}_2))| = \mathcal{O}(h). \tag{3.6}$$

Thus, we see that after multiplying (3.3) by h, the latter 2 terms in (3.3) go to zero as $h \to 0$.

We also need to justify that

$$\begin{gathered}
|b^B_{\zeta_2\cdot(A_2-A_1)}(a_2, e^{ix\cdot\xi}h^{m/2}\bar{r}_1)| = \mathcal{O}(h), \quad |b^B_{\zeta_2\cdot(A_2-A_1)}(h^{m/2}r_2, e^{ix\cdot\xi}h^{m/2}\bar{a}_1)| = \mathcal{O}(h), \\
|b^B_{\zeta_2\cdot(A_2-A_1)}(h^{m/2}r_2, e^{ix\cdot\xi}h^{m/2}\bar{r}_1)| = \mathcal{O}(h)
\end{gathered} \tag{3.7}$$

We only show why $b^B_{\zeta_2\cdot(A_2-A_1)}(a_2, e^{ix\cdot\xi}h^{m/2}\bar{r}_1) =)(h)$. The proof for other two terms follows similarly. By Proposition 2.2, we have for any $m \geq 2$,

$$\begin{aligned}
|b^B_{\zeta_2\cdot(A_2-A_1)}(a_2, e^{ix\cdot\xi}h^{m/2}\bar{r}_1)| &\leq ||A_2 - A_1||_{W^{-\frac{m}{2}+1,p'}(\mathbb{R}^n)}||h^{m/2}\bar{r}_1||_{H^{\frac{m}{2}-1}(B)}||a_2||_{H^{\frac{m}{2}}(B_2)} \\
&= \mathcal{O}(h)||r_1||_{H^{\frac{m}{2}-1}_{scl}(B)} = \mathcal{O}(h).
\end{aligned}$$

From (3.5), (3.6) and (3.7), we see that (3.4) is indeed justified.

Remark 3.3. *Observe that because our A and q are rough, by duality and Sobolev multiplication, we get estimates in $H^{m/2}(\Omega)$ norm and hence we need a decay of $h^{m/2}$ so that the $H^{m/2}_{scl}$ norm of the correction term is $\mathcal{O}(1)$. If we had just used an $\mathcal{O}(h)$ decay then we would eventually have to use Sobolev estimates in $H^1(\Omega)$, which would require A and q to have higher regularity.*

Now plug in $a_1 = a_2 = 1$ in (3.4) to obtain

$$\langle(\mu_1 + i\mu_2)\cdot(A_1 - A_2), e^{ix\cdot\xi}\rangle = 0.$$

We can run the whole argument starting from the construction of ζ_1 and ζ_2, this time with the triple $(\mu_1, -\mu_2, \xi)$ to obtain

$$\langle(\mu_1 - i\mu_2)\cdot(A_1 - A_2), e^{ix\cdot\xi}\rangle = 0.$$

The last two equalities then imply

$$\mu\cdot(\hat{A}_2(\xi) - \hat{A}_1(\xi)) = 0 \quad \text{for all} \quad \mu, \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n \quad \text{with} \quad \mu\cdot\xi = 0. \tag{3.8}$$

For each $\xi = (\xi_1, \xi_2, ..., \xi_n)$ and for $j \neq k$, $1 \leq j, k \leq n$, consider the vector $\mu = \mu(\xi, j, k)$ such that $\mu_j = -\xi_k$, $\mu_k = \xi_j$ and all other components equal to zero. Therefore, μ satisfies $\mu \cdot \xi = 0$. Hence, from (3.8), we obtain

$$\xi_j \cdot (\hat{A}_{1,k}(\xi) - \hat{A}_{2,k}(\xi)) - \xi_k \cdot (\hat{A}_{1,j}(\xi) - \hat{A}_{2,j}(\xi)) = 0,$$

which proves

$$\partial_j(A_{1,k} - A_{2,k}) - \partial_k(A_{1,j} - A_{2,j}) = 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega, \quad 1 \leq j, k \leq n,$$

in the sense of distributions.

To prove $A_1 = A_2$, we consider $A_1 - A_2$ as a 1- current and using the Poincare lemma for currents, we conclude that there is a $g \in \mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $\nabla g = A_1 - A_2$; see [28]. Note that g is a constant outside $\bar{B}$ since $A_1 - A_2 = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \bar{B}$ (also near ∂B). Considering $g - c$ instead of g, we may instead assume $g \in \mathcal{E}'(\bar{B})$.

To show $A_1 = A_2$, consider (3.4) with $a_1(\cdot, \mu_1 - i\mu_2) = 1$ and $a_2(\cdot, \mu_1 + i\mu_2)$ satisfying

$$(\mu_1 + i\mu_2) \cdot \nabla) a_2(x, \mu_1 + i\mu_2) = 1 \quad \text{in} \quad B.$$

Such a choice of $a_2(\cdot, \mu_1 + i\mu_2)$ is possible because of (3.2). The previous equation is an inhomogeneous $\bar{\partial}$-equation and we can solve it by setting

$$a_2(x, \mu_1 + i\mu_2) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{\chi(x - y_1\mu_1 - y_2\mu_2)}{y_1 + iy_2} \, dy_1 \, dy_2,$$

where $\chi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is such that $\chi = 1$ near $\bar{B}$; see [30, Lemma 4.6].

From (3.4), we have

$$b^B_{(\mu_1 + i\mu_2) \cdot \nabla g}(a_2, e^{ix \cdot \xi}) = 0.$$

Now, use the fact that $\mu_1 \cdot \xi = \mu_2 \cdot \xi = 0$ to get

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= -b^B_{(\mu_1 + i\mu_2) \cdot \nabla g}(a_2, e^{ix \cdot \xi}) = -\langle (\mu_1 + i\mu_2) \cdot \nabla g, e^{ix \cdot \xi} a_2 \rangle_B \\ &= \langle g, e^{ix \cdot \xi} (\mu_1 + i\mu_2) \cdot \nabla a_2 \rangle_B = \langle g, e^{ix \cdot \xi} \rangle_B. \end{aligned}$$

Since g is compactly supported, this gives $g = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$, and in B in particular, implying $A_1 = A_2$.

To show $q_1 = q_2$, substitute $A_1 = A_2$ and $a_1 = a_2 = 1$ in to the identity (3.1) to obtain

$$b^B_{q_2 - q_1}(1 + h^{m/2} r_2, (1 + h^{m/2} \bar{r}_1) e^{ix \cdot \xi}) = 0. \tag{3.9}$$

Let $h \to 0$ to get $\hat{q}_1(\xi) - \hat{q}_2(\xi) = 0$ for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$. To justify this we need to show that

$$b^B_{q_2 - q_1}(h^{m/2} r_1, e^{ix \cdot \xi}) \to 0, \; b^B_{q_2 - q_1}(h^{m/2} r_2, e^{ix \cdot \xi}) \to 0, \; b^B_{q_2 - q_1}(h^{m/2} r_2, h^{m/2} \bar{r}_1 e^{ix \cdot \xi}) \to 0$$

as $h \to 0$. We will only consider the term $b^B_{q_2 - q_1}(h^{m/2} r_1, e^{ix \cdot \xi})$. The justification for the other two terms follows similarly. We have for any $m \geq 2$

$$\begin{aligned} |b^B_{q_2 - q_1}(h^{m/2} r_1, e^{ix \cdot \xi})| &\leq C ||q_2 - q_1||_{W^{-\frac{m}{2} + \delta, r'}(\mathbb{R}^n)} ||e^{ix \cdot \xi}||_{H^{\frac{m}{2} - \delta}(B)} ||h^{\frac{m}{2}} r_1||_{H^{\frac{m}{2} - \delta}(B)} \\ &= \mathcal{O}(h^\delta) ||r_1||_{H^{\frac{m}{2} - \delta}_{scl}(B)} = \mathcal{O}(h^\delta) ||r_1||_{H^{\frac{m}{2}}_{scl}(B)} = \mathcal{O}(h^\delta). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\hat{q}_1(\xi) - \hat{q}_2(\xi) = 0$ for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we get $q_1 = q_2$ in B.

Remark 3.4. *If we take $\delta = 0$, then we see that all we can say using Propostion 2.2 is that $|b^B_{q_2 - q_1}(h^{m/2} r_1, e^{ix \cdot \xi})| = \mathcal{O}(1)$. This is why we impose slightly higher regularity for q.*

Appendix A. Properties of D_A and m_q

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 3$, be a bounded open set with smooth boundary, and $m \geq 2$ be an integer. Let A and q satisfy (1.2) and (1.3), respectively. As before, in what follows, $W^{s,p}$ is the standard L^p based Sobolev space on $\mathbb{R}^n$, $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $1 < p < \infty$ defined using Bessel potential.

We start by considering the bi-linear forms

$$B_A^{\mathbb{R}^n}(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}) = \langle A, \tilde{v} D\tilde{u} \rangle, \quad b_q^{\mathbb{R}^n}(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}) = \langle q, \tilde{u}\tilde{v} \rangle, \qquad \tilde{u}, \tilde{v} \in H^m(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

The following result shows that the forms $B_A^{\mathbb{R}^n}$ and $b_q^{\mathbb{R}^n}$ are bounded on $H^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$. The proof is based on a property of multiplication of functions in Sobolev spaces.

Proposition A.1. *The bi-linear forms $B_A^{\mathbb{R}^n}$ and $b_q^{\mathbb{R}^n}$ on $H^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$ are bounded and satisfy for any $m \geq 2$,*

$$|b_q^{\mathbb{R}^n}(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v})| \leq C||q||_{W^{-\frac{m}{2}+\delta, r'}(\mathbb{R}^n)} ||\tilde{u}||_{H^{\frac{m}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^n)} ||\tilde{v}||_{H^{\frac{m}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^n)},$$
$$|B_A^{\mathbb{R}^n}(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v})| \leq C||A||_{W^{-\frac{m}{2}+1+, p'}(\mathbb{R}^n)} ||\tilde{u}||_{H^{\frac{m}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^n)} ||\tilde{v}||_{H^{\frac{m}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^n)}.$$

Proof. Using the duality between $W^{-\frac{m}{2}+\delta, r'}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $W^{\frac{m}{2}-\delta, r}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, we conclude from Proposition 2.2 that for all $\tilde{u}, \tilde{v} \in H^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $m \geq 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} |b_q^{\mathbb{R}^n}(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v})| &\leq C||q||_{W^{-\frac{m}{2}+\delta, r'}(\mathbb{R}^n)} ||\tilde{u}\tilde{v}||_{W^{\frac{m}{2}-\delta, r}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \\ &\leq C||q||_{W^{-\frac{m}{2}+\delta, r'}(\mathbb{R}^n)} ||\tilde{u}||_{H^{\frac{m}{2}-\delta}(\mathbb{R}^n)} ||\tilde{v}||_{H^{\frac{m}{2}-\delta}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \\ &\leq C||q||_{W^{-\frac{m}{2}+\delta, r'}(\mathbb{R}^n)} ||\tilde{u}||_{H^{\frac{m}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^n)} ||\tilde{v}||_{H^{\frac{m}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^n)}. \end{aligned}$$

(The hypotheses for Proposition 2.2 are satisfied for $m \leq n$ with $p_1 = p_2 = 2$, $r = p \in (1, \frac{2n}{2n-m+2\delta}]$, $s_1 = \frac{m}{2} - \delta$, $s_2 = \frac{m}{2} - \delta$. For $m > n$, we choose $p_1 = p_2 = 2$, $r = p \in (1, 2]$, $s_1 = \frac{m}{2} - \delta$, $s_2 = \frac{m}{2} - \delta$.)

We now give the proof for the bi-linear form $B_A^{\mathbb{R}^n}$. Using the duality between $W^{-\frac{m}{2}+1, p'}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $W^{-\frac{m}{2}+1, p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ we conclude from Proposition 2.2 that for all $\tilde{u}, \tilde{v} \in H^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$, for $m > 2$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} |B_A^{\mathbb{R}^n}(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v})| &\leq C||A||_{W^{-\frac{m}{2}+1, p'}(\mathbb{R}^n)} ||D\tilde{u}\tilde{v}|_{W^{\frac{m}{2}-1, p}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \\ &\leq C||A||_{W^{-\frac{m}{2}+1, p'}(\mathbb{R}^n)} ||D\tilde{u}||_{H^{\frac{m}{2}-1}(\mathbb{R}^n)} ||\tilde{v}||_{H^{\frac{m}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \\ &\leq C||A||_{W^{-\frac{m}{2}+1, q}(\mathbb{R}^n)} ||\tilde{u}||_{H^{\frac{m}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^n)} ||\tilde{v}||_{H^{\frac{m}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^n)}. \end{aligned}$$

(The hypotheses for Proposition 2.2 are satisfied for $m < n$ with $p_1 = p_2 = 2$, $p \in (1, \frac{2n}{2n-m}]$, $s_1 = \frac{m}{2} - 1$, $s_2 = \frac{m}{2}$. For $m = n$ and $m = n + 2$, we choose $p_1 = p_2 = 2$, $p \in (1, 2)$, $s_1 = \frac{m}{2} - 1$, $s_2 = \frac{m}{2}$. Finally, for other m, we choose $p_1 = p_2 = 2$, $p \in (1, 2]$, $s_1 = \frac{m}{2} - 1$, $s_2 = \frac{m}{2}$.)

For the case $m = 2$, using Hölder's inequality and Sobolev embedding we get

$$\begin{aligned} |B_A^{\mathbb{R}^n}(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v})| &\leq C||A||_{L^n(\mathbb{R}^n)} ||D\tilde{u}\tilde{v}|_{L^{n'}(\Omega)} \\ &\leq C||A||_{L^n(\mathbb{R}^n)} ||D\tilde{u}||_{H^{\frac{m}{2}-1}(\Omega)} ||\tilde{v}||_{H^{\frac{m}{2}}(\Omega)} \\ &\leq C||A||_{L^n(\mathbb{R}^n)} ||\tilde{u}||_{H^{\frac{m}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^n)} ||\tilde{v}||_{H^{\frac{m}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^n)}. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is thus complete. ∎

Now, we show that the operators B_A and b_q defined in (1.4) are indeed well defined. Recall that

$$B_A(u, v) := B_A^{\mathbb{R}^n}(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}), \quad b_q(u, v) := b_q^{\mathbb{R}^n}(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}), \qquad u, v \in H^m(\Omega),$$

where $\tilde{u}, \tilde{v} \in H^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$ are any extensions of u and v, respectively. We want to show that this definition is independent of the choice of extensions $\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}$. Indeed, let $u_1, u_2 \in H^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be such that $u_1 = u_2 = u$ in Ω, and let $v_1, v_2 \in H^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be such that $v_1 = v_2 = v$ in Ω. It is enough to show that for all $w \in H^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$,

$$B_A^{\mathbb{R}^n}(u_1, w) = B_A^{\mathbb{R}^n}(u_2, w), \quad B_A^{\mathbb{R}^n}(w, v_1) = B_A^{\mathbb{R}^n}(w, v_2)$$

and

$$b_q^{\mathbb{R}^n}(u_1, w) = b_q^{\mathbb{R}^n}(u_2, w), \quad b_q^{\mathbb{R}^n}(w, v_1) = b_q^{\mathbb{R}^n}(w, v_2).$$

Since A and q are supported in $\bar{\Omega}$ and since $u_1 = u_2$ and $v_1 = v_2$ in Ω, we have

$$B_A^{\mathbb{R}^n}(u_1 - u_2, w) = \langle A, D(u_1 - u_2)w\rangle = 0, \quad b_q^{\mathbb{R}^n}(w, v_1 - v_2) = \langle q, w(v_1 - v_2)\rangle = 0$$

and

$$B_A^{\mathbb{R}^n}(w, v_1 - v_2) = \langle A, (v_1 - v_2)Dw\rangle = 0, \quad b_q^{\mathbb{R}^n}(u_1 - u_2, w) = \langle q, (u_1 - u_2)w\rangle = 0.$$

The next result shows that the bi-linear forms B_A and b_q are bounded on $H^m(\Omega)$.

Proposition A.2. *The bi-linear forms B_A and b_q are bounded on $H^m(\Omega)$ are bounded and satisfy for any $m \geq 2$*

$$|b_q(u, v)| \leq C||q||_{W^{-\frac{m}{2}+\delta, r'}(\mathbb{R}^n)}||u||_{H^{\frac{m}{2}}(\Omega)}||v||_{H^{\frac{m}{2}}(\Omega)}$$
$$|B_A(u, v)| \leq C||A||_{W^{-\frac{m}{2}+1, p'}(\mathbb{R}^n)}||u||_{H^{\frac{m}{2}}(\Omega)}||v||_{H^{\frac{m}{2}}(\Omega)}$$

for all $u, v \in H^m(\Omega)$.

Proof. This easily follows from the previous proposition in exactly the same way as in [2, Proposition A.2]. ∎

Now, for $u \in H^m(\Omega)$, we define $D_A(u)$ and $m_q(u)$ for any $v \in H_0^m(\Omega)$ by

$$\langle D_A(u), v\rangle_\Omega := B_A(u, v), \quad \langle m_q(u), v\rangle_\Omega := b_q(u, v).$$

The following result, which is an immediate corollary of Proposition A.2, implies that D_A and m_q are bounded operators from $H^m(\Omega) \to H^{-m}(\Omega)$. The norm on $H^{-m}(\Omega)$ is the usual dual norm given by

$$||v||_{H^{-m}(\Omega)} = \sup_{0 \neq \phi \in H_0^m(\Omega)} \frac{|\langle v, \bar{\phi}\rangle_\Omega|}{||\phi||_{H^m(\Omega)}}.$$

Corollary A.3. *The operators D_A and m_q are bounded from $H^m(\Omega) \to H^{-m}(\Omega)$ and satisfy*

$$||m_q(u)||_{H^{-m}(\Omega)} \leq C||q||_{W^{-\frac{m}{2}+\delta, r'}(\mathbb{R}^n)}||u||_{H^m(\Omega)}$$
$$||D_A(u)||_{H^{-m}(\Omega)} \leq C||A||_{W^{-\frac{m}{2}+1, p'}(\mathbb{R}^n)}||u||_{H^m(\Omega)} \tag{A.1}$$

for all $u \in H^m(\Omega)$.

Finally, we state the following identities which are useful for defining the adjoint of $\mathcal{L}_{A,q}$.

Proposition A.4. *For any $u, v \in H^m(\Omega)$, the forms B_A and b_q satisfy the following identities*

$$B_A(u, v) = -B_A(v, u) - b_{D\cdot A}(u, v) \quad \text{and} \quad b_q(u, v) = b_q(v, u).$$

Proof. Since the proof repeats that of [2, Proposition A.4] almost word for word, we omit it. ∎

Appendix B. Well-posedness and Dirichlet-to-Neumann map

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 3$ be a bounded open set with smooth boundary, and let A and q be as in (1.2) and (1.3) respectively with $m \geq 2$. For $f = (f_0, f_1, ..., f_m - 1) \in \prod_{j=0}^{m-1} H^{m-j-1/2}(\partial\Omega)$, consider the Dirichlet problem

$$\mathcal{L}_{A,q} u = 0 \text{ in } \Omega \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma u = f \text{ on } \partial\Omega, \tag{B.1}$$

where γ is the Dirichlet trace operator $\gamma : H^m(\Omega) \to \prod_{j=1}^{m-1} H^{m-j-1/2}(\partial\Omega)$ which is bounded and surjective; see [13, Theorem 9.5].

First aim of this appendix is to use standard variational arguments to show well-posedness of problem (B.1). We start with the following inhomogeneous problem

$$\mathcal{L}_{A,q} u = F \text{ in } \Omega \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma u = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega, \quad F \in H^{-m}(\Omega). \tag{B.2}$$

To define a sesquilinear form a associated to the problem (B.2), for $u, v \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$, we can integrate by parts and get

$$\langle \mathcal{L}_{A,q} u, \bar{v} \rangle_\Omega = \sum_{|\alpha|=m} \frac{m!}{\alpha!} \int_\Omega D^\alpha u \, \overline{D^\alpha v} \, dx + \langle D_A(u), \bar{v} \rangle_\Omega + \langle m_q(u), \bar{v} \rangle_\Omega := a(u, v)$$

Hence, we define a on $H_0^m(\Omega)$ by

$$a(u, v) := \sum_{|\alpha|=m} \frac{m!}{\alpha!} \int_\Omega D^\alpha u \, \overline{D^\alpha v} \, dx + \langle D_A(u), \bar{v} \rangle_\Omega + \langle m_q(u), \bar{v} \rangle_\Omega, \qquad u, v \in H_0^m(\Omega).$$

We now show that this sesquilinear form a is bounded on $H_0^m(\Omega)$. Using duality and Proposition A.2, for $u, v \in H_0^m(\Omega)$, we obtain

$$|a(u, v)| \leq C ||u||_{H^m(\Omega)} ||v||_{H^m(\Omega)}$$

thereby showing boundedness of a. Also, Poincare's inequality for $u \in H_0^m(\Omega)$ gives

$$||u||^2_{H^m(\Omega)} \leq C \sum_{|\alpha|=m} ||D^\alpha u||^2_{L^2(\Omega)}$$

Split $q = q^\sharp + (q - q^\sharp)$ with $q^\sharp \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{C})$ and $||q - q^\sharp||_{W^{-\frac{m}{2}+\delta, r'}(\mathbb{R}^n)}$ small enough, and split $A = A^\sharp + (A - A^\sharp)$ with $A^\sharp \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{C}^n)$ and $||A - A^\sharp||_{W^{-\frac{m}{2}+1, p'}(\mathbb{R}^n)}$ small enough. Using Poincare's inequality and Proposition A.2, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
Re\, a(u, u) &\geq \sum_{|\alpha|=m} \frac{m!}{\alpha!} ||D^\alpha u||^2_{L^2(\Omega)} - |B_A(u, \bar{u})| - |b_q(u, \bar{u})| \\
&\geq C \sum_{|\alpha|=m} ||D^\alpha u||^2_{L^2(\Omega)} - |B_{A^\sharp}(u, \bar{u})| - |b_{q^\sharp}(u, \bar{u})| - |B_{A-A^\sharp}(u, \bar{u})| - |b_{q-q^\sharp}(u, \bar{u})| \\
&\geq C||u||^2_{H^m(\Omega)} - ||A^\sharp||_{L^\infty(\Omega)} ||Du||_{L^2(\Omega)} ||u||_{L^2(\Omega)} - ||q^\sharp||_{L^\infty(\Omega)} ||u||^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
&\quad - C'||A - A^\sharp||_{W^{-\frac{m}{2}+1, p'}(\mathbb{R}^n)} ||u||^2_{H^{\frac{m}{2}}(\Omega)} - C'||q - q^\sharp||_{W^{-\frac{m}{2}+\delta, r'}(\mathbb{R}^n)} ||u||^2_{H^{\frac{m}{2}}(\Omega)} \\
&\geq C||u||^2_{H^m(\Omega)} - ||A^\sharp||_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \frac{\epsilon}{2} ||Du||^2_{L^2(\Omega)} - ||A^\sharp||_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \frac{1}{2\epsilon} ||u||^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
&\quad - ||q^\sharp||_{L^\infty(\Omega)} ||u||^2_{L^2(\Omega)} - C'||A - A^\sharp||_{W^{-\frac{m}{2}+1, p'}(\mathbb{R}^n)} ||u||^2_{H^{\frac{m}{2}}(\Omega)} \\
&\quad - C'||q - q^\sharp||_{W^{-\frac{m}{2}+\delta, r'}(\mathbb{R}^n)} ||u||^2_{H^{\frac{m}{2}}(\Omega)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Choose $\epsilon > 0$ to be sufficiently small to get

$$Re\, a(u, u) \geq C||u||^2_{H^m(\Omega)} - C_0||u||^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad C, C_0 > 0, \quad u \in H_0^m(\Omega).$$

Therefore, the seqsuilinear form a is coercive on $H_0^m(\Omega)$. Compactness of the embedding $H_0^m(\Omega) \hookrightarrow H^{-m}(\Omega)$ together with positivity of bounded operator $\mathcal{L}_{A,q} + C_0 I : H_0^m(\Omega) \to H^{-m}(\Omega)$ imply that $\mathcal{L}_{A,q} : H_0^m(\Omega) \to H^{-m}(\Omega)$ is Fredholm with zero index and hence Fredholm alternative holds for $\mathcal{L}_{A,q}$; see [24, Theorem 2.33]. (B.2) thus has a unique solution $u \in H_0^m(\Omega)$ if 0 is outside the spectrum of $\mathcal{L}_{A,q}$.

Now, consider the Dirichlet problem (B.1) and assume 0 is not in the spectrum of $\mathcal{L}_{A,q}$. We know that there is a $w \in H^m(\Omega)$ such that $\gamma w = f$. According to the Corollary (A.3), we have $\mathcal{L}_{A,q} w \in H^{-m}(\Omega)$. Therefore $u = v + w$ with $v \in H_0^m(\Omega)$ being the unique solution of the equation $\mathcal{L}_{A,q} v = -\mathcal{L}_{A,q} w \in H^{-m}(\Omega)$ is the unique solution of the Dirichlet problem (B.1).

Under the assumption that 0 is not in the spectrum of $\mathcal{L}_{A,q}$, the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map is defined as follows: let $f, h \in \prod_{j=0}^{m-1} H^{m-j-1/2}(\partial\Omega)$. Set

$$\langle \mathcal{N}_{A,q} f, \bar{h} \rangle_{\partial\Omega} := \sum_{|\alpha|=m} \frac{m!}{\alpha!} (D^\alpha u, D^\alpha v_h)_{L^2(\Omega)} + B_A(u, \bar{v}_h) + b_q(u, \bar{v}_h), \tag{B.3}$$

where u is the unique solution of the Dirichlet problem (B.1) and $v_h \in H^m(\Omega)$ is an extension of h, that is $\gamma v_h = h$. To see that this definition is independent of v_h, let $v_{h,1}, v_{h,2} \in H^m(\Omega)$ be such that $\gamma v_{h,1} = v_{h,2} = h$. Since $w = v_{h,1} - v_{h,2} \in H_0^m(\Omega)$ and u solves the Dirichlet problem (B.1), we have

$$0 = \langle \mathcal{L}_{A,q} u, \bar{w} \rangle_\Omega = \sum_{|\alpha|=m} \frac{m!}{\alpha!} (D^\alpha u, D^\alpha w)_{L^2(\Omega)} + B_A(u, \bar{w}) + b_q(u, \bar{w}).$$

This shows that the definition (B.3) is independent of the extension v_h. Next we show that $\mathcal{N}_{A,q}$ is a bounded operator from $\prod_{j=0}^{m-1} H^{m-j-1/2}(\partial\Omega)$ into $\prod_{j=0}^{m-1} H^{-m+j+1/2}(\partial\Omega)$.

From the boundedness of the sesquilinear form a it follows that

$$|\langle N_{A,q} f, \bar{h} \rangle_{\partial\Omega}| \leq C ||u||_{H^m(\Omega)} ||v_h||_{H^m(\Omega)} \leq C ||f||_{\prod_{j=0}^{m-1} H^{m-j-1/2}(\partial\Omega)} ||h||_{\prod_{j=0}^{m-1} H^{m-j-1/2}(\partial\Omega)},$$

where

$$||g||_{\prod_{j=0}^{m-1} H^{-m+j+1/2}(\partial\Omega)} = (||g_0||^2_{H^{m-1/2}(\partial\Omega)} + ... + ||g_{m-1}||^2_{H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)})^{1/2}.$$

is the product norm on the space $\prod_{j=0}^{m-1} H^{m-j-1/2}(\partial\Omega)$. Here we have used the fact that the extension operator $\prod_{j=0}^{m-1} H^{m-j-1/2}(\partial\Omega) \ni h \mapsto v_h \in H^m(\Omega)$ is bounded; see [13, Theorem 9.5]. Hence, $\mathcal{N}_{A,q}$ maps $\prod_{j=0}^{m-1} H^{m-j-1/2}(\partial\Omega)$ into $\big(\prod_{j=0}^{m-1} H^{m-j-1/2}(\partial\Omega)\big)' = \prod_{j=0}^{m-1} H^{-m+j+1/2}(\partial\Omega)$ continuously.

Appendix C. Bessel potential spaces versus Slobodeckij spaces

In this section, we show why it is important to consider the Sobolev spaces as defined by the Bessel potential.

There is an alternative, non-equivalent way to generalize the definition of an integer valued Sobolev space to allow fractional exponents. We can define Sobolev spaces with non-integer exponents as Slobodeckij spaces, i.e. if $s = k + \theta$ with $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $\theta \in (0,1)$, then for $p \in [1, \infty)$,

$$H^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^n) = \{u \in W^{k,p}(\mathbb{R}^n) : ||u||_{H^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)} < \infty\},$$

where

$$||u||_{H^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)} := ||u||_{W^{k,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \Big(\sum_{|\alpha|=k} \int \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n} |\frac{\partial^\alpha(x) - \partial^\alpha(y)|}{|x-y|^{n+\theta p}} \, dx \, dy \Big)^{1/p}$$

If $s < 0$ and $p \in (1, \infty)$, we define $H^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^n) = (H^{-s,p/(p-1)}(\mathbb{R}^n)^*$.

We use the Bessel potential definition in this paper as that definition gives more flexibility with regards to multiplication as the following result shows.

Proposition C.1. *Suppose $s, s_1 \geq 0$, $s \notin \mathbb{Z}$ and $p_1, p_2, p > 1$. If the pointwise multiplication of functions is a continuous bi-linear map $H^{s,p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times H^{s_1,p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \hookrightarrow H^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, then $p_1 \leq p$.*

Proof. Follows from [4, Proposition 4.3]. ∎

References

[1] R. A. Adams, *Sobolev Spaces*, Academic Press, New York, 1975.
[2] Y. M. Assylbekov, *Inverse problems for the perturbed polyharmonic operator with coefficients in Sobolev spaces with non-positive order*, Inverse Problems **32** (2016), 105009.
[3] Y. M. Assylbekov, Y. Yang, *Determining the first order perturbation of a polyharmonic operator on admissible manifolds*, Journal of Differential Equations **262** (2017), 590–614.
[4] A. Behzadan, N. Holst, *Multiplication in Sobolev Spaces, Revisited*, arXiv:1512.07379.
[5] R. Brown, *Global uniqueness in the impedance-imaging problem for less regular conductivities*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **27** (1996), no. 4, 1049–1056.
[6] A. P. Calderon, *On an inverse boundary value problem*, Seminar on Numerical Analysis and its Applications to Continuum Physics, Rio de Janeiro (1980), 65–73.
[7] P. Caro, K. Rogers, *Global uniqueness for the Calderón problem with Lipschitz conductivities*, Forum of Mathematics, Pi (2016), Vol. 4, p. e2. Cambridge University Press.
[8] S. Chanillo, *A problem in electrical prospection and an n-dimensional Borg–Levinson theorem*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **108** (1990), no. 3, 761–767.
[9] L. D. Faddeev, *Increasing solutions of the Schrödinger equation*, Soviet Physics Doklady **10** (1966), 1033–1035.
[10] G. Folland, *Real Analysis, Modern Techniques and their Applications*, John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1984.
[11] F. Gazzola, H.-C. Grunau, G. Sweers, *Polyharmonic boundary value problems*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2010.
[12] A. Greenleaf, M. Lassas, G. Uhlmann, *The Calderón problem for conormal potentials. I. Global uniqueness and reconstruction*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **56** (2003), no. 3, 328–352.
[13] G. Grubb, *Distributions and operators*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 252. Springer, New York, 2009.
[14] B. Haberman, *Unique determination of a magnetic Schrdinger operator with unbounded magnetic potential from boundary data*, arXiv:1512.01580.
[15] B. Haberman, D. Tataru, *Uniqueness in Calderón's problem with Lipschitz conductivities*, Duke Math. J. **162** (2013), no. 3, 497–516.
[16] B. Haberman, *Uniqueness in Caldern's problem for conductivities with unbounded gradient*, Comm, Math. Phys. **340**(2) (2015), 639–659.
[17] M. Ikehata, *A special Green?s function for the biharmonic operator and its application to an inverse boundary value problem*, Comput. Math. Appl. **22** (1991), no. 4–5, 53–66.
[18] V. Isakov, *Completeness of products of solutions and some inverse problems for PDE*, J. Differential Equations **92** (1991), no. 2, 305–316.
[19] C. Kenig, J. Sjöstrand, G. Uhlmann, *Carleman estimates and inverse problems for Dirac operators*, Ann. Math. **165** (2007), 567–91.
[20] K. Krupchyk, M. Lassas, G. Uhlmann, *Inverse Boundary value Problems for the Perturbed Polyharmonic Operator*, Transactions AMS, **366** (2014), 95–112.
[21] K. Krupchyk, G. Uhlmann, *Uniqueness in an inverse boundary problem for a magnetic Schrödinger operator with a bounded magnetic potential*, Comm. Math. Phys., **327** (2014), 993–1009.
[22] K. Krupchyk, G. Uhlmann, *Inverse boundary problems for polyharmonic operators with unbounded potentials*, J. Spectr. Theory, **6** (2016), no. 1, 145–183.
[23] R. Lavine, A. Nachman, unpublished, announced in A. I. Nachman, *Inverse scattering at fixed energy*, Mathematical physics, X (Leipzig, 1991), 434–441, Springer, Berlin, 1992.
[24] W. McLean, *Strongly elliptic systems and boundary integral equations*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000.
[25] G. Nakamura, Z. Sun, G. Uhlmann, *Global identifiability for an inverse problem for the Schrödinger equation in a magnetic field*, Math. Ann. **303** (1995), no. 3, 377–388.
[26] R. G. Novikov, *A multidimensional inverse spectral problem for the equation $-\Delta\psi + (v(x) - Eu(x))\psi = 0$*, Funktsional. Anal. i Prilozhen. **22** (1988), no. 4, 11–22.
[27] L. Päivärinta, A. Panchenko, G. Uhlmann, *Complex geometrical optics solutions for Lipschitz conductivities*, Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana **19** (2003), no. 1, 57–72.

[28] G. de Rham, *Differentiable manifolds. Forms, currents, harmonic forms*, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, **266**. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1984.
[29] T. Runst, W. Sickel, *Sobolev spaces of fractional order, Nemytskij operators, and nonlinear partial differential operators*, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, 1996.
[30] M. Salo, *Inverse problems for nonsmooth first order perturbations of the Laplacian*, Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math. Diss. **139** (2004).
[31] M. Salo, L. Tzou, *Carleman estimates and inverse problems for Dirac operators*, Math. Ann. **344** (2009), no. 1, 161–184.
[32] Z. Sun, *An inverse boundary value problem for Schrödinger operators with vector potentials*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **338** (1993), no. 2, 953–969.
[33] J. Sylvester, G. Uhlmann, *A global uniqueness theorem for an inverse boundary value problem*, Ann. of Math. (2) **125** (1987), no. 1, 153–169.
[34] C. Tolmasky, *Exponentially growing solutions for nonsmooth first-order perturbations of the Laplacian*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **29** (1998), no. 1, 116–133.
[35] G. Tuhin, *An inverse problem on determining up to first order perturbations of a fourth order operator with partial boundary data*, Inverse Problems **31** (2015):105009.
[36] G. Tuhin, V. P. Krishnan, *Determination of lower order perturbations of the polyharmonic operator from partial boundary data*. Appl. Anal., **95** (11): 2444–2463, 2016.

Department of Mathematics, Northeastern University, Boston, MA 02115, USA

E-mail address: y_assylbekov@yahoo.com

Department of Mathematics, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195-4350, USA

E-mail address: karthik2@uw.edu